



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tribution of inscriptions; the possible ignorance and the probable nonchalance of Aristophanes in the introduction of dialectic matter; the still undigested MS tradition; the variant orthography, etc. He draws several conclusions. The first he states as follows (page 222):

Aristophanes represented the Megarian dialect correctly as a rule, but has been guilty of not a few incorrect forms, chiefly for metrical purposes, but partly apparently through ignorance When he had to choose between a Megarian form and a joke, he chose the latter.

(2) His treatment of the Boeotian dialect, Mr. Elliott thinks (231), "is decidedly less accurate than his treatment of the Megarian". (3) Judging mainly from the *Lysistrata*, Mr. Elliott concludes (240) that "Aristophanes was more careful in regard to the Laconian dialect than to the Megarian, and much more than to the Boeotian in the *Acharnians*".

A comparison of the readings in the editions of Dindorf (1847) and of Starkie (1909) with those offered by Mr. Elliott in the long Megarian scene (*Ach.* 729-835) may serve to illustrate the textual betterment or change. Aside from some more or less obvious changes in punctuation, accent, speakers, etc., there are for these lines in Mr. Elliott's text 20 divergences from Dindorf's. Of these changes, however, 15 are identical with those already made or accepted by Starkie. But Starkie has 18 other divergences where Elliott's text reverts to that of Dindorf. In addition, it may be observed, more than half of Elliott's changes from Dindorf's text, in the lines in question, have to do with the supposed Megarian words, and, therefore, if these 100 odd lines represent roughly his conclusions for the whole text, we find that the editor's searching scrutiny of the textual evidence results, for him, in a tendency to revert largely to the long established text.

The proof reading is accurate.

Supplementing the Introduction, where he states his general conclusions and the method of his selection among the readings given in the (Latin) critical footnotes, Mr. Elliott appends copious notes in English at the end of the text (126-180).

To dissent off-hand from Mr. Elliott's selections of readings must presuppose at least an equal knowledge of the elements contributory to establishing a sound text of Aristophanes, and specialists differ as to the precedence to be accorded to certain MSS. But, in any case, Greek scholars must be grateful to the editor for his unsparing labor in obtaining and reviewing his data. In metrical matters, as is perhaps natural, he is somewhat impatient of "hypothesis" as against MS authority. Thus, in *Ach.* 47, he retains (with Starkie) in a trimeter the tabooed combination $\circ\circ\circ\circ$ (but see J. W. White: *The Verse of Greek Comedy*, 49). No one, however, can charge him with a tendency to suppress any of the steps by which he arrives at a given conclusion, and it would be ungracious to complain of his occasional naïveté in assuming that certain philological and

epigraphical phenomena, long since recognized, may be novel to readers otherwise competent to profit by his thoroughgoing and admirable analysis of perplexing and conflicting data.

BROWN UNIVERSITY.

FRANCIS G. ALLINSON.

Caesar: *Gallic War*, Books I and II. Edited, with Notes, Summary of Forms and Syntax, Prose Composition, and Vocabulary, by Ernst Riess and Arthur L. Janes. Combined with Janes's *Sight Reading*. New York: American Book Company (1914). Pages 305 + 238 + 56. 12 maps, 50 illustrations. \$1.20.

By combining Books I and II of the *Gallic War* with Janes's *Sight Reading*, already published, this volume aims to meet the special requirements of the New York State Department of Education, and, by adding composition and grammatical material, to furnish a complete text-book for second year Latin. The book has nearly double the usual quantitative requirement of text for this year, which is the equivalent of the first four books of the *Gallic War*, about 80 full pages. We find here the 48 full pages of Books I and II, 52 pages of selections from Books III-VII, 29 from the *Civil War*, and 27 from *Nepos*; there is, therefore, abundant opportunity for the exercise of individual preference. The Grammatical Summary includes 33 pages of forms and 31 of syntax, to which is added a list of words in Books I and II that occur over five times in Caesar, listed under the chapter where they first occur. The Composition Exercises are based on B. G. I-II and give a connected narrative of the campaigns, but there is no reference to special chapters, and constructions are taken up systematically. The sentences for translation, all of which are recommended for oral rather than for written work, are quite short, and for the most part admirably suited to their purpose. The selections for sight reading have been judiciously made and carefully annotated. Besides the two Vocabularies there is a page and a half discussion of word formation, and a 16 page index of Proper Names to cover the sight reading.

In the Preface the editors say that, in annotating the two books of the *Gallic War*, they "have regarded their practical experience in the classroom as their safest guide", and not only these notes, but also the statements in the Grammatical Summary show many indications of the work of experienced teachers, who have not hesitated to think things out for themselves. In spite of these excellences, however, the book is badly marred by many careless or inaccurate statements. The reviewer has noted over one hundred passages in the notes on the first two books and in the Grammatical Summary which, in his opinion, will require some change when the book is revised. Only a few of these can here be given.

It is said in the Introduction (page 24) that the *pilum* "could be fetched back, in case of a miss, by means of a leather strap fastened to its end". This statement appears to have no adequate authority, and the method

described seems extremely impracticable. It is possible that the *amentum* is referred to, which was a short strap, used only for throwing.

Notes, I. 1¹.—"tres: numerals commonly precede their nouns". In B. G. 1-6, 63 cardinals precede their nouns, 96 follow.

I. 28.—"*cum* <omnibus> *copiis*: in military expressions, accompaniment is commonly expressed by the ablative without a preposition". This is really inexcusable, for careful statements in regard to the usage have long been available. *cum* is always found with verbs of *contention*, with definite numbers, and when no adjective is used with the ablative noun. In B. G. 1-6 there are 68 military expressions of accompaniment that have *cum* and six that do not. In all six the noun is *copiis*; in four of the six *copiis* refers to the same persons as the subject, thus making impossible the literal notion of accompaniment. All such cases where *cum* is omitted are classified by Gildersleeve-Lodge as ablatives of manner. In Nepos the count gives 80 instances with *cum* and none without.

I. 117.—"*iubeo* is followed by an infinitive in indirect discourse". This is surely confusing.

I. 187.—"*vastari*: complementary to *defuerint*. Notice the tense. Since in English *ought*, *must* show no difference between past and present tense, past action must be expressed by the complementary infinitive: *he ought to come*, *he ought to have come*". The reference to *must* is gratuitous, and for its ordinary meaning of *obligation* is incorrect. The past tense of *must go* is *had to go*, not *must have gone*, which means something very different.

I. 792.—"Distinguish *persuadeo* = *persuade*, *make plausible*, with *ut* clause, from *persuadeo* = *convince* with accusative and infinitive". 'Persuade' belongs with both uses of *persuadeo*; 'make plausible' belongs with the second use, not with the first.

I. 799.—"*cum* . . . *videbatur*: the subjunctive should have been used. But the indicative emphasizes the *fact* and thus stimulates the soldiers to do as well". The Latin quotation is from Caesar's speech to his army just before the battle with Ariovistus. It takes a peculiar twist of imagination to picture Caesar, the historian, as retaining, for the purpose of stimulating his soldiers, the indicative which he used in his speech to them six years before. As to the emphasis on the fact, in regard to which the editors agree with most commentators, why should Caesar, the historian, wish to emphasize to his readers, as a fact, this particular statement about the merits of Marius's army, instead of reporting it as part of what he once said to his soldiers? Is not the original indicative retained here, as frequently with *dum*, meaning *while*, in order to keep the distinctive meaning which its use with *cum* has in direct discourse?

2. 2.—"Caesar never uses the first person singular in speaking of himself". *never* is a big word. Witness

¹In references to the Notes the second figure gives the line of the book.

here *dixeram*, 2. 24. 1; *commemoravi*, 4. 16. 2, 4. 17. 1; *demonstraveram*, 4. 27. 2.

2. 9.—"*Germanos versari*". This and similar object infinitives elsewhere are called *complementary*, although in Grammatical Summary 163. 2 that term is limited to infinitives without subject accusative.

2. 81.—"With the impersonal verb *interest* . . . the degree of interest is expressed by an ablative of degree of difference". The only trouble with this statement is that the ablative case seems to be one of the few ways *not* used for this purpose, the permissible constructions being the genitive, the accusative, or an adverb.

Grammatical Summary, 98. 2 (Ablative of Place).—"No preposition is used with ablatives of *locus* and *pars*, when modified by an adjective; or with any noun when modified by *totus*". As a matter of fact, the preposition is quite common with all these combinations.

100. 1.—"Before a word beginning with *h* or a vowel, *ab* and *ex* are used; elsewhere *a* and *e* are generally found". *Ex* is far commoner than *e* before consonants.

107. b.—"*Nostrum* and *vestrum* <are used> only as partitives". In the four Catiline orations there are two instances (I. 1; I. 2) of the partitive use of these words and six instances of the possessive, with *omnium*. Compare also *maiores vestrum*, Sallust Catilina 33.

108. 2.—The following sentence is used to illustrate the indirect reflexive: "Si se invito transisse conabantur, prohibere poterat". This sentence has been changed from the original just enough to spoil it (for that original, compare B. G. 1. 8. 2 Castella communit, quo facilius, si se invito transire conarentur, prohibere possit). The indirect reflexive is regularly limited to indirect clauses (part of the thought of the main subject), such as this was in Caesar, but is not in the sentence used here.

127. c.—The following sentence is used to illustrate *dum*, meaning *until*, with the indicative: "*expectavit dum milites convenerunt*, 'he waited till the soldiers collected'". *Exspecto dum*, from the very meaning of the verb, always denotes anticipation, and so is always used with the subjunctive in classical prose.

134.—"Concessive clauses introduced by *quamquam* and (in Caesar) by *etsi*, *tametsi* take the indicative". What this may have been intended to mean is that Caesar does not use *quamquam*. What it seems to indicate is that other authors do not use *etsi* and *tametsi*.

Page 279.—"*Ubi homo venit?* When will the man come?" Interrogative *ubi* never means *when*.

P. 284.—Sentence 17 requires the present subjunctive in a result clause after a past tense. Neither in the Grammatical Summary, however, nor elsewhere, is anything said of the possibility of such a sequence.

P. 299, Sentence 9.—"Until they have been driven from the woods, no attack will be made upon them". The references here would require *dum*, but good Latin would require *priusquam*.

P. 305. Two sentences here require *dixit ut*, and one, *dixit ne*. These combinations can be found, if one looks far enough, but it seems unnecessary, and perhaps a bit dangerous to suggest them to a student of Latin in his second year.

PHILLIPS ACADEMY,
Andover, Mass.

B. M. ALLEN.

A MODERN EPISTOLARY PAST

Ways of thought and of expression, however peculiar, are not confined to one place or to a single period of time, as we are constantly seeing; but the following parallel to a certain Roman tense usage seems to me rather rare in this twentieth century, and so to be worth recording.

A boy of five, one rainy day when he could not play out-of-doors, was seized with a desire to write to his favorite uncle, and so informed his mother. She consented thereto, and asked him what he wished to say in his letter. He didn't know. She said, "What have you been doing to-day?" He said, "I had some popcorn". She said, "Then tell him that. And how will you say it?" The boy began, "I had some popcorn *yesterday*". But his mother interrupted, "Not yesterday, but to-day. What made you say *yesterday*?" And the answer was, "*It will be yesterday when uncle reads it!*"

Explanations followed, and the toilsomely printed letter arrived with the statement, "I had some popcorn to-day". But the incident, though concerned merely with the adverb, illuminates the Epistolary Past of the Romans, and is respectfully recommended to those teachers who, under the New Requirements in Latin, read some of Cicero's delightful Letters as a partial substitute for, or supplement to, the hereditary list of Orations.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

ROLAND G. KENT.

LATIN CLUB AT SUMMER SESSION, 1915

As an outgrowth of lively interest in Latin at the past Summer Session of Columbia University a Club was formed by the women students resident there in Furnald Hall, to consider ways and means of arousing interest among pupils of Latin in the Secondary Schools. At the weekly meetings there were discussions of Latin Clubs in High Schools, Latin Periodicals published by Students, and Latin Plays and Songs. The Appleton Latin games and original Latin versions of popular English games were played by the members of the Club, and the real fun and value of such means were clearly proven. The Club also visited the unusual collection of models and antiques at Hunter College.

The last meeting of the Club took the form of a reception to the entire body of Latin Students at the Summer Session. The programme included an address in Latin by Professor Knapp, an address by Professor McCrea, a Latin hymn sung by an accomplished contralto, the musical rendering of the opening lines of

Vergil's Aeneid by a chorus, and attractive Greek dances by members of a class in Physical Education.

BRITA L. HORNER, *President*.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

The Classical Association of Northern California held its annual meeting at the University of California, Berkeley, on July 8. The event was one of the most important on the programme of the High School Teachers' Association of California. Dr. H. C. Nutting, of the University of California, presided. There were present one hundred and ten enthusiastic and discriminating men and women, keenly alive to the fact that a man is a man before he is a mechanic, a farmer, or whatever you will in trade or profession. Mr. Noel Garrison set forth this gospel in clear and convincing speech in his paper on The Cultural and Vocational in the High School Programme. Mr. F. W. Thomas suggested the postponement of the reading of Caesar until the fourth half-year. This was supported warmly by Dr. Deutsch, of the University of California. Miss Anna S. Cox, of San José, charmed her audience with a paper on April Among the Greek Mountains.

Mr. Cleghorn, of San Francisco, appealed to the teachers to realize their responsibility in the work of awakening the community in which they live to an appreciation of the Golden Bough of knowledge, and to an endeavor to open by this magic wand eyes blinded by a too near vision of the big dollar.

Dr. Nutting suggested the affiliation of the three Classical Associations of the Pacific States—The Classical Association of Northern California, The Classical Association of the Pacific Northwest, and The Classical Association of Southern California. The members present approved the suggestion, and a Committee was elected, with Dr. Nutting as Chairman, to take the steps necessary to promote discussion with the different organizations relative to this movement.

The following are the officers for 1915-1916: President, J. H. Humphries, Palo Alto; Vice-President, Miss Anna Cox, San José; Secretary-Treasurer, Miss Mary Byrd Clayes, Berkeley; executive committee: F. W. Thomas, Sacramento, and Noel Garrison, Stockton.

MARY BYRD CLAYES,
Secretary-Treasurer.

THE LATIN LEAGUE OF WISCONSIN COLLEGES

The third annual contest of the Latin League of Wisconsin Colleges was held April 30, 1915, at the University of Wisconsin¹. The examination questions were set by the Latin Department of the University of Michigan. There were twenty candidates. The awards were made as follows: Henry Achley (Carroll), The Louis G. Kirchner Prize of \$250 and The Gold Medal; John G. Frayne (Ripon), The Silver Medal;

¹See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 7. 14; 8. 46-47.